

Amdt. dated March 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 17, 2003

Serial No. 09/382,621
Docket No. TUC919990034US1
Firm No. 0018.0057

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 11, 14, 20, 23, and 24 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-32 are patentable over the art of record and allowance is respectfully requested of claims 1-32.

Applicants' would like to thank Examiner Zhen for hold a telephone interview with their representative, Janaki K. Davda, on March 3, 2004 at 1:00 p.m. (EST). During the telephone interview, claim 1 and the Kazi patent were discussed. Agreement was reached that an amendment to claim 1 that "one extent defines a range of tracks between a beginning track and an end track" would overcome the cited art.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Zhen for the indication of allowance of claims 3-5, 14-16, and 25-27.

Additionally, in paragraph 1, the Office Action indicates that claims 2, 6-10, 12-13, 17-19, 21-22, 24, and 28-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, the Office Action indicates that claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objection and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowability. At this time, Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 23, from which claims 2, 6-10, 12-13, 17- 22, 24, and 28-32 depend.

In paragraph 3, claim 20 is objected to Claim 20 has been amended to overcome the objection and place it in better form.

Amdt. dated March 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 17, 2003

Serial No. 09/382,621
Docket No. TUC919990034US1
Firm No. 0018.0057

In paragraph 5, claims 1, 11, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haye (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,932) in view of Kazi (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,543). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 describes building a list of parameters to include with a command. A plurality of input parameters are received, wherein each input parameter comprises at least one extent, and wherein one extent defines a range of tracks between a beginning track and an end track. It is determined whether a number of the input parameters exceeds a threshold number of parameters that are capable of being included in the command. Content of multiple input parameters are merged into at least one output parameter if the number of input parameters exceeds the threshold number, wherein the content of the input parameters is included in a number of output parameters that does not exceed the threshold. The output parameters are included with the command.

The Office Action cites the Haye patent at Col. 5, lines 23-33, as teaching that an input parameter comprises at least one extent. The Haye patent describes a data collection represented as a list of devices each containing a list of track extents. The Office Action also states that the Haye patent "does not explicitly teach merging the parameter list according to a threshold."

The Office Action cites the Kazi patent at Col. 2, lines 9-57 and Col. 12, lines 13-35 as teaching receiving a plurality of input parameters based on the text of the Kazi patent "providing a name list for names extracted from documents to be coreferenced prior to or upon entry of a query by a user." Such a name list, however, does not teach or suggest, a plurality of input parameters, wherein each input parameter comprises at least one extent, and wherein one extent defines a range of tracks between a beginning track and an end track.

The Office Action also cites the Kazi patent as teaching determining whether a number of the input parameters exceeds a threshold number of parameters that are capable of being included in the command by citing the text of the Kazi patent of "comparing contexts of mergable names against the exclusive sets to merge the mergable names to the exclusive sets exceeding a predetermined threshold to form an aggregated cross document name list." The Kazi patent

Amdt. dated March 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 17, 2003

Serial No. 09/382,621
Docket No. TUC919990034US1
Firm No. 0018.0057

describes a threshold as a minimum number of common terms (Col. 12, lines 26-31). This teaches away from the claimed threshold being a number of parameters that are capable of being included in the command. Also, the Kazi patent determines whether there is a match between a mergable name and an exclusive set, where the match is based on the number of terms the two lists share (Col. 12, lines 26-31). On the other hand, Applicants' claimed invention describes determining whether the input parameters exceed a threshold number of parameters that are capable of being included in the command.

The Office Action cites the Kazi patent as teaching merging content of multiple input parameters into at least one output parameter if the number of input parameters exceeds the threshold number, wherein the content of the input parameters is included in a number of output parameters that does not exceed the threshold by citing the text of the Kazi patent that "if the threshold is exceeded, the mergable name will merge with the exclusive set it matched best" and that there is an "aggregated cross-document name list including a list of variant names for the entity." The Kazi patent describes merging a mergable name with an exclusive set based on the set that it best matched and if the number of common terms (threshold) is exceeded. This teaches away from merging if the number of input parameters exceeds the number of parameters that can be included in a command. Also, Applicants' claim recites that the number of output parameters does not exceed the threshold. On the other hand, the Kazi patent does not make any determination about the exclusive sets, into which mergable names are merged, meeting a threshold.

The Office Action cites the Kazi patent as teaching including the output parameters with the command based on the text of the Kazi patent "providing a list of documents to the user referencing the variant names and the name of the entity used for the search query." Applicants respectfully submit that merely providing a list of documents does not teach or suggest including the output parameters, which do not exceed the threshold, in any command.

Therefore, neither the Haye patent nor the Kazi patent, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1.

Amdt. dated March 15, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 17, 2003

Serial No. 09/382,621
Docket No. TUC919990034US1
Firm No. 0018.0057

Independent claims 11 and 23 are not taught or suggested by the Haye patent or the Kazi patent, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2, 6-10, 12-13, 17- 22, 24, and 28-32 incorporate the language of independent claims 1, 11, or 23, respectively, and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 6-10, 12-13, 17- 22, 24, and 28-32 are not taught or suggested by the Haye patent or the Kazi patent, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 11, and 23.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-32 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: March 15, 2004

By: 

Janaki K. Davda
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984